

that just the Federal Government would come in at some point and give me \$6 for some percentage of those that I raised might be pretty appealing, but I think it would be wrong.

It takes jurisdiction away from the States into how to draw congressional districts. Now, this is going to be inconvenient if it passes because the Constitution specifically says the State legislatures decide how to draw a congressional district. It doesn't say the Congress of the United States tells the State legislatures how to draw congressional districts, but this bill would do that.

The bill requires redistricting commissions. It dictates who would serve on the commissions. It sets the criteria and the procedures for how you draw the maps. It lays out how the commissions have to take public input.

And if that weren't bad enough—it doesn't stop there—it even determines which courts act on all redistricting cases. And this would be a dramatic change where, again, you have a one-size-fits-all system in a country that clearly is not a one-size-fits-all country.

Since very few States currently have commissions like that, it would set a lot of deadlines that we don't currently have. Districts drawn using 2020 census data would all but be guaranteed to be drawn by Federal courts just because of the time that this bill sets out.

But the Federal court drawing the district isn't the big problem. The big problem is forever you have changed this and forever you have put the DC Circuit as the ultimate circuit to determine all redistricting cases. We have never thought that power belonged in Washington, DC, before, but this bill does.

It is an unprecedented power grab by the Federal Government at the expense of the States. I think it is a transparent attempt to stack elections in favor of one party. Election law should not be about a single party.

If this bill were to pass, it would do nothing, in my view, to bolster public confidence in elections. In fact, I suspect most election officials around the country would begin to say: I would like to be able to do something about that problem, but we will have to clear that with Washington, DC, first.

I think the divisions in the country would be worse, not better. Successful election laws are passed on a bipartisan basis. We did that with the Help America Vote Act after 2000. We provided assistance and some direction with the finances, but we didn't change a single State law after 2016. We left that up to the States. We created bipartisan impact when we did that.

We should continue to put the strength and the security of the country's elections before party. We should continue to oppose the efforts of a single party to make sweeping partisan changes in our election system. I don't talk to anybody who doesn't think that this bill, as a similar bill passed the

House, would pass the House on a purely partisan basis. That would be a bad idea.

I encourage my colleagues to look carefully at S. 1, and I think if you do, a majority of the Senate will not support this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

FOREIGN THREAT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on March 6 of this year, the intelligence community issued its "Intelligence Community Assessment on Foreign Threats to the 2020 U.S. Federal Elections." Based on that report, some in the liberal media have falsely claimed that my and Senator JOHNSON's Hunter Biden-related oversight activity last Congress was based on Russian disinformation. Even Peter Strzok felt the need to chime in on Twitter to say that we received Russian disinformation.

I don't know how many times I have to say it, but such claims are false and misleading. To be precise, Senator JOHNSON and I didn't receive, solicit, or rely upon any information from Andrii Derkach, and we publicly said so many times.

I don't know how many times last fall I was on this floor of the U.S. Senate trying to explain that to the people who were making those accusations. It seems like Strzok pays just about as careful attention to these facts as he did to the Crossfire FISA applications. Of course, Twitter lets

disinformation about the Steele dossier run wild on their platform yet shuts down still unrefuted reporting on Hunter Biden before the 2020 election. In other words, we have a double standard.

Now, regarding Russian disinformation, it wasn't Senator JOHNSON and this Senator that dealt in it. It happens to be very clear that the other side, the Democrats, were dealing with it. Here's one quick example. If you want more, then I would refer you to section 10 of our September 23, 2020, report.

On July 13, 2020, then-Minority Leader SCHUMER, Senator WARNER, Speaker PELOSI, and Representative SCHIFF sent a letter with a classified attachment to the FBI to express a purported belief that Congress was the subject of a foreign disinformation campaign.

The classified attachment to that letter included unclassified elements that attempted, but failed, to tie our work to Derkach. Those unclassified elements were leaked to the press to support a false campaign accusing us two Senators of using Russian disinformation.

Then, during the course of our investigation, we ran a transcribed interview of George Kent. Before that interview, the Democrats acquired Derkach's materials. During that interview, they asked the witness about it. He stated: "What you're asking me to interpret is a master chart of disinformation and malign influence."

At that interview, the Democrats introduced known disinformation into the investigative record as an exhibit. More precisely, the Democrats relied upon and disseminated known disinformation from a foreign source whom the intelligence community warned was actively seeking to influence U.S. politics. Yet now—can you believe this?—they accuse this Senator and Senator JOHNSON of doing that very thing. Now let that sink in because there is a case of double standard around here.

It is clear that the Democrats hope that their self-created disinformation campaign would drown out our report and its findings to protect Candidate Biden from the facts. Now that President Biden is in office, the facts aren't going anywhere.

I had an opportunity to serve 28 years in the Senate with Senator Biden. I liked him then; I still like him. But that doesn't mean that I like the double standard the press has toward President Biden and us Republicans.

As President Biden gears up for his first press conference, he ought to answer for the fact that his family was and possibly still is financially connected to Chinese nationals with links to the Communist Party and the People's Liberation Army. Indeed, Hunter Biden reportedly admitted that he was well aware that some of his business associates were connected to the Communist Chinese Government intelligence services. Now, double standard—where is the media in asking serious questions about that?

It has also been reported that emails show Joe Biden and his brother were "office mates" with the very same Chinese nationals with links to the Communist regime and the its military. Now, talk about a double standard. Where is the media in asking serious questions about that? Yet they are reporting this very day about things that Johnson and Grassley did about disinformation, which I have told you so many times we never received.

Now there is this interview on television with Tony Bobulinski, publicly stating that Joe Biden was aware of and possibly involved in Hunter Biden's business deals. Talk about a double standard. Where is the media asking serious questions about that?

The Biden family transactions and associations in our September 20 report raised criminal, counterintelligence, and extortion concerns. Yet the media—the liberal media—has ignored all of it and has failed to ask any legitimate questions. Don't you think that we the people have a right to know the answers?

The media certainly seemed to think so in all the doings of the Trump administration. If the story I just laid out here were about Trump, I guarantee you that it would be all over the news.

It is perfectly legitimate and reasonable for Congress and the news media to question the Biden administration

about these global financial transactions and associations. It is perfectly legitimate to ask how they could impact the Biden administration's foreign policy. That is especially true as it relates to China, given the extensive links between the Biden family and that country. Let's see if anyone dares to ask questions at the President's first news conference.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. President, on another subject, I want to discuss the national security threats facing our country.

A recent poll showed 45 percent of Americans acknowledge that China is the greatest threat to the United States. A year ago, that percentage was half that number thinking that China was a threat, the greatest threat to the United States.

Frankly, this year, no other nation came close to what they think about China being a threat—not Russia, not North Korea, not Iran. These were all far behind.

Half of Americans believe China is the world's leading economic power. A record 63 percent say that the economic power of China is a critical threat to the United States.

Now, we all know the American people are smart. They are perceiving exactly what is happening with the United States vis-a-vis China or China vis-a-vis the rest of the world. China wants to supplant our country as the greatest nation and the greatest economy in the world, and China will do it if we are blind to that danger.

Everywhere I see the threat of China's rise minimized. On Tuesday, I saw a very curious thing in the declassified "Intelligence Community Assessment of Foreign Threats to the 2020 U.S. Elections." The intelligence community determined that China did not engage in pervasive election meddling but noted that was in part because China saw the risk associated with doing so.

The intelligence community determined that China would not be excited if President Trump had won the 2020 election because he would "challenge China's rise."

The National Intelligence Officer for Cyber Issues, in particular, found that the Government of China wanted former President Trump to be defeated in the general election, preferring "the election of a more predictable member of the establishment instead." And "China took at least some steps to undermine former President Trump's reelection chances, primarily through social media and official public statements and media."

Yet some in the news media read this very same report that I read and declared triumphantly and falsely that there was nothing to fear from China in terms of influencing our elections. It is pretty clear why China would not want a President unafraid to assert American national interests. That means demanding reciprocal trade, secure borders, and a defense policy focused on American national interests.

We all know that China has been playing us for suckers. China continues to try to expand its influence globally, including in international bodies like the World Bank and the World Health Organization. It doesn't seek to play by the rules but to exploit its influence for its own advantage at the expense of the United States and probably any free country because they don't like democracy.

In this same assessment I saw that Iran, another enemy, also wanted to defeat a strong American President and sow division. Many others—Lebanese Hezbollah, the Government of Cuba, and the Maduro Government of Venezuela—they all had the very same idea. They all wanted to defeat President Trump. Only Russia seems to have preferred Trump but just according to that assessment—although I remember reading a year ago during the primaries that Senator BERNIE SANDERS was also a favorite of Russia. He had to have a defensive briefing, meaning Senator SANDERS, because Russia wanted to help his campaign.

Also, remember, it was then-Vice President Biden who first announced the naive and disastrous Obama "reset" appeasement policy toward Russia. This, coming in the wake of Russia's invasion of our ally, Georgia, arguably gave Putin the idea that he could get away with invading Crimea and Ukraine.

Let's also take this moment to recall that when the Obama Justice Department and the FBI saw threats from Russia during the 2016 election, they didn't do what they did for SANDERS. They didn't defensively brief Trump and his team. Instead, do you know where they went? They opened Cross-fire Hurricane and outrageously used briefings to Trump and his associates as intelligence gathering operations, ultimately wasting years of taxpayer money and time.

Abraham Lincoln once said:

America will never be destroyed from the outside. If we lose our freedoms it will be because we have destroyed ourselves from within.

In fact, the goal of what the KGB calls "active measures," like disinformation since Soviet times, has been to pit Americans against each other to cause us to destroy ourselves.

That brings me to another related point. As I see this seat of democracy fortified with walls and barbed wire while the people, the citizens, and the taxpayers are kept out, I can't help but think about where we will go from here.

Yet the Democrats can only speak of destroying the filibuster during these difficult times. When I hear talk of destroying the filibuster—the very tools that force bipartisanship and ensure that those representing all Americans are heard and that America act as one being abolished forever—I am worried. If the slimmest of majorities is about to impose its will on the other half of the country from inside an armed

bunker, the Russians will have achieved their ultimate goal.

We are not our own enemies to be silenced and to be fenced in. We are one Nation, but we must pull together and acknowledge what it means when countries like China and Iran, our enemies and our adversaries, don't want us to put our country's interest first.

FREE SPEECH

Mr. President, then, on my last point, I want to bring up another few remarks on the First Amendment, as I have spoken a couple of times before very recently.

I have come to the floor over the last few weeks to talk about the First Amendment, one of America's most cherished pillars of freedom. Unfortunately, in recent years, we have seen a corrosive culture undermining sacred civic freedoms Americans risk taking for granted. Too often we don't think about the freedoms we have because we were born here.

We can learn a lot from immigrants that come to this country and appreciate Americans for our freedoms. Whenever I go to these citizenship ceremonies we have for immigrants, I always tell them: I wish you would tell—when you hear some American complaining about what is wrong with America, I hope you know from your experience in other lands that you came here for freedom. Remind us of how lucky we are to have what we were born into.

Silencing the free exchange of ideas has infiltrated college campuses and even the American workplace. It has even affected journalism, traditional media, and all across our social media platforms. We all know that not all speech is protected by the First Amendment and, occasionally, we in the United States fall into a discussion about the technical boundaries of the First Amendment when we talk about the meaning and the merits of free speech.

Now, the health of our democracy depends on free speech to foster an informed public, something that I think Thomas Jefferson made very clear. If democracy is going to work, it is going to have to work with an educated public. The rigorous exchange of ideas inform debate on issues affecting our lives and enables individuals to challenge power and also to challenge orthodoxy.

In theory, the institutions of the "fourth estate" should be the staunchest defenders of the First Amendment. I think I said it before, but you can't say it too often—and there is probably a 100 different ways you can say it—but I always like to say that journalists are the police of our constitutional system to make sure that everybody and all follow the rule of law. What they bring to the people of this country about how our government functions makes everything very transparent, and when things are transparent, you have accountability.

So as I think about these things, it has been baffling to watch over the last